



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/608,882	06/26/2003	Shivaram Bhat	03226.496001;P9015	7843
32615	7590	10/09/2007	EXAMINER	
OSHA LIANG L.L.P./SUN 1221 MCKINNEY, SUITE 2800 HOUSTON, TX 77010			JOHNSON, CARLTON	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2136	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/09/2007	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

lord@oshaliang.com
hernandez@oshaliang.com
DOCKETING@OSHALIANG.COM

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/608,882	BHAT ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Carlton V. Johnson	2136

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 July 2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1,2,4,5,7-11,13,14,16-20 and 22-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1,2,4,5,7-11,13,14,16-20,22-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114.

Applicant's submission filed on 7/19/2007 has been entered.

2. This action is responding to application papers filed **7-19-2007**. Claims **1, 2, 4, 5, 7 - 11, 13, 14, 16 - 20, 22 - 25** are pending. Claims **1, 4, 5, 10, 13, 14, 19** have been amended. Claims **3, 6, 12, 15, 21** have been cancelled. Claims **1, 10, 19** are independent.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed 7/19/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

3.1 Applicant argues that within the referenced prior art, "*Moriconi does not disclose any distribution of policy decisions by the policy manager*". (see Remarks Page 9)

The Office Action does not state that Moriconi discloses, "a distribution of policy decisions by the policy manager". The claimed invention does not mention the term

"policy manager". The Office Action does not have to disclose limitations that are not stated in the claimed invention. The citations in the Office Action state the limitations the Moriconi prior art discloses.

3.2 Applicant argues that within the referenced prior art, "*Singhal is completely silent regarding what happens if an application level policy at a policy decision point is changed that may affect a policy decision previously provided to the AIG*". (see Remarks Page 10)

The Office Action does not state that Singhal discloses, "what happens if an application level policy at a policy decision point is changed that may affect a policy decision previously provided to the AIG. The claimed invention does not mention the term "AIG". The Office Action does not have to disclose limitations that are not stated in the claimed invention. The citations in the Office Action state the limitations the Singhal prior art discloses.

3.3 Applicant argues that the referenced prior art does not disclose, *usage of hindsight.. (see Remarks Page 11)*

In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper.

See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

The Moriconi prior art has already made the decision that the storage of policy decisions is advantageous over the storage of policy rules. The Singhal prior art discloses the capability to update policy rules and transfer the updated rules to remote nodes. The combined Moriconi and Singhal prior art combination discloses that the propagation of updated rules as updated policy decisions to enable the advantage of the usage of decisions over rules achieves a time saving advantage. This would be obvious to one skilled in the art.

3.4 Applicant argues that the referenced prior art does not disclose, obviousness.
(see Remarks Page 11-12)

An achieved advantage is a motivation for the combination of prior art references. The rejection to each independent and dependent claim includes a citation from the referenced prior art that discloses the basis for the rejection. Each obviousness combination clearly indicates the claim limitation the combined reference prior art teaches. In addition, a cited passage from the referenced prior art clearly indicates the motivation for the obviousness combination. Each obviousness combination's disclosure is equivalent to the Applicant's claimed invention.

3.5 Based on the specification a notification is a distribution of updated security policy information. Applicant's specification indicates that notification is defined such that, "*... In one such embodiment, the notification also includes an updated version of the policy decision based on the change. ...*", and "*... In one embodiment, when a*

policy definition is changed, the source (e.g., the policy server) sends out notifications to the PEPs, or at least to those PEPs that are affected by the change. ... “, (see Specification paragraph [0012]).

The Moriconi prior art discloses the capability to send out a notification, or to distribute a set of updated version of the security policy information. (see Moriconi paragraph [0082], lines 8-13: distribute updated policy information)

The Moriconi and Singhal prior art combination discloses the local memory storage and a remote source for security policy information, and the distributed environment of the Moriconi prior art discloses the remote storage of security policy information. (see Moriconi paragraph [0046], lines 3-9: distributed network environment (i.e. client-server), remote source; see Singhal paragraph [0062], lines 7-11: policy decision storage in local memory))

The terms, “*first request*”, “*second request*”, and “*third request*”, is not disclosed within the specification or the original claims. The term “*subsequent request*” is disclosed within the specification and the original claims. These terms indicate that there is no distinction between request(s). All requests are equal.

3.6 The Examiner has considered Applicant's Remarks concerning methods and systems for controlling access to resources. When a user attempts to access a resource via a remote interface, the request is initially evaluated by a source of policy definitions such as a policy server, and a policy decision is returned and stored in

Art Unit: 2136

memory. The remote interface can then evaluate subsequent requests from the user for the resource using the stored policy decision instead of having to communicate again with the source for the policy decision. Accordingly, policy definitions and decisions are more efficiently implemented.

After an additional analysis of the applicant's invention, remarks, and a search of the available prior art, it was determined that the current set of prior art consisting of **Moriconi (20030115322)**, **Singhal (20050021818)**, and **Chakraborty (20040054791)** discloses the Applicant's Invention including disclosures in Remarks dated July 19, 2007.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 9 - 11, 13, 14, 16, 18 - 20, 22, 24, 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Moriconi et al. (US PGPUB No. 20030115322)** in view of **Singhal et al. (US Patent No. 20050021818)**.

Regarding Claim 1, Moriconi discloses a method, computer-readable medium having computer-readable program code embodied therein for causing a computer system to

Art Unit: 2136

perform a method of controlling access to resources, said method comprising:

- b) receiving a first request for access to said resource, said first request comprising
said requester identifying information; (see Moriconi paragraph [0050], lines 1-5:
program, computer usable medium; paragraph [0068], lines 1-3: access request
processed, subject or requestor identified)

Moriconi discloses storing a policy definition for a resource in local memory, said policy decision based on a policy definition governing access to said resource and on requester identifying information provided to said source, and evaluating said request using said policy decision in said local memory instead of referring said request to said source for evaluation. (see Moriconi paragraph [0068], lines 4-9: process or evaluate access request; paragraph [0076], lines 16-19; paragraph [0024], lines 1-9: policy definition processed locally or by local security policy, policy definition local client security policy stored within local memory, access policy based on subject or requestor identification) Moriconi does not specifically disclose a policy decision for a resource in local memory, said policy decision received from a source of policy definitions, said policy decision based on a policy definition governing access to said resource.

However, Singhal discloses:

- a) a policy decision for a resource in local memory, said policy decision received from a remote source of policy definitions, said policy decision based on a policy definition governing access to said remote resource; (see Singhal paragraph [0062], lines 7-11: policy decision storage in local memory)

Art Unit: 2136

- c) evaluating said first request using said policy decision in said local memory (see Singhal paragraph [0062], lines 7-11: storage policy decision parameter in local memory)

And, Moriconi and Singhal disclose:

- d) receiving a notification from said remote source; (see Moriconi paragraph [0082], lines 8-13: distribute (i.e. notification) of policy information update)
- e) receiving a second request for access to said resource, said second request comprising said request to identifying information; and evaluating said second request based on said. ; (see paragraph [0068], lines 4-9: evaluate request)

Moriconi does not specifically disclose the processing of an updated policy decision.

However, Singhal discloses wherein said policy decision further comprises said notification comprising an update version of said policy decision, and storing an updated version of said policy decision in said local memory, (see Singhal paragraph [0062], lines 7-11: local memory storage of policy (rules, decisions))

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Moriconi as taught by Singhal to enable the usage of a updated policy decision for a resource in local memory, said policy decision received from a source of policy definitions, said policy decision based on a policy definition governing access to said resource. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Singhal in order to enable the provisioning of better services by content providers. (see Singhal paragraph [0062], lines 1-6: "... provide content providers 106, third

party application providers 108 and partner portals 110 with more information about the user and network capabilities to enable provision of better services, inline context injection is done in the HTTP header by HTTP application handler 208 ... ")

Regarding Claim 2, Moriconi discloses the method and computer usable medium of claims 1, wherein said resource is affiliated with another resource, and wherein further a policy decision for said other resource is received from said remote source and stored in said local memory. (see Moriconi paragraph [0050], lines 1-5: program, computer usable medium; paragraph [0024], lines 1-9: local client security policy to a client, policy definition within local memory; paragraph [0056], lines 1-12: linked resources, policy for 2nd resource based on 1st resource) Moriconi does not specifically disclose the processing of a policy decision. However, Singhal discloses wherein a policy decision for said other resource. (see Singhal paragraph [0062], lines 7-11: local memory storage of policy decision)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Moriconi as taught by Singhal to enable the usage of a policy decision parameter within a security management environment. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Singhal in order to enable the provisioning of better services by content providers. (see Singhal paragraph [0062], lines 1-6)

Regarding Claims 4, 13, Moriconi discloses the method of claims 1, 10 wherein said notification identifies resources affected by said changes. (see Moriconi paragraph

[0082], lines 7-10: only changes to policy definition are incorporated and transmitted)

Moriconi does not specifically disclose the processing of a policy decision. However, Singhal discloses wherein said policy decision further comprises storing an updated version of said policy decision in said local memory, (see Singhal paragraph [0062], lines 7-11: local memory storage of policy (rules, decisions))

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Moriconi as taught by Singhal to enable the usage of a updated policy decision for a resource in local memory, said policy decision received from a source of policy definitions, said policy decision based on a policy definition governing access to said resource. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Singhal in order to enable the provisioning of better services by content providers. (see Singhal paragraph [0062], lines 1-6)

Regarding Claim 5, Moriconi discloses the method of claims 1, wherein receiving said notification (see Moriconi paragraph [0082], lines 8-13: distribute (i.e. notification policy information updates) wherein said notification also comprises said updated version of said policy definition in said local memory. (see Moriconi paragraph [0082], lines 1-3: updated version of policy definition; paragraph [0082], lines 7-13: updated version transmitted to clients; paragraph [0068], lines 4-9: evaluate policy information request)

Regarding Claim 7, Moriconi discloses the method of claim 1 further comprising: sending a message to said remote source, said message requesting updates for policy

definitions stored in said local memory. (see Moriconi paragraph [0024], lines 1-9: local client security policy transmitted to a client, policy definition within local memory; paragraph [0174], lines 1-5: request to server for policy change information) Moriconi does not specifically disclose processing security information utilizing a policy decision parameter. However, Singhal discloses wherein policy decisions stored in said memory. (see Singhal paragraph [0062], lines 7-11: local memory storage of policy decision)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Moriconi as taught by Singhal to enable the usage of a policy decision parameter within a security management environment. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Singhal in order to enable the provisioning of better services by content providers. (see Singhal paragraph [0062], lines 1-6)

Regarding Claims 9, 24, Moriconi discloses the method, computer usable medium of claims 1, 19 wherein a condition associated with said policy definition is also received from said remote source and stored locally, wherein said condition is enforced locally. (see Moriconi paragraph [0024], lines 1-9: local client security policy transmitted to a client, policy definition within local memory; paragraph [0047], lines 17-20: policy enforced locally)

Regarding Claims 10, 25, Moriconi discloses a method of controlling access to resources, said method comprising:

- a) receiving a request for access to a resource, said request comprising requestor identifying information, wherein said request is referred to a source of a policy definition that governs access to said resource for evaluation; (see Moriconi paragraph [0068], lines 1-3: access request processed, subject or requestor identified)
- b) receiving from said source a policy decision for said resource, said policy decision based on said policy definition and said requestor identifying information; (see Moriconi paragraph [0068], lines 4-9: policy decision determined) and

Moriconi discloses wherein storing said policy decision in local memory, wherein a subsequent request for said resource is evaluated locally using said policy decision stored in memory. (see Moriconi paragraph [0076], lines 16-19: policy definition in local memory; paragraph [0047], lines 15-20: policy definition enforced based on local security policy or locally) Moriconi does not specifically disclose processing security information utilizing a policy decision parameter.

However, Singhal discloses:

- c) storing said policy decision in local memory, (see Singhal paragraph [0062], lines 7-11: local memory storage of policy decision)

And, Moriconi and Singhal disclose:

- d) receiving a notification from said remote source comprising said policy decision has been updated, wherein a third request for access to said resource is

evaluated based on said notification. (see Moriconi paragraph [0082], lines 8-13: distribute (i.e. notification) updated policy information; paragraph [0068], lines 4-9: evaluate request)

Moriconi does not specifically disclose the processing of an updated policy decision. However, Singhal discloses wherein said policy decision further comprises said notification comprising an update version of said policy decision, and evaluated based on an updated version of said policy decision in said local memory, (see Singhal paragraph [0062], lines 7-11: local memory storage of policy (rules, decisions))

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Moriconi as taught by Singhal to enable the usage of a policy decision parameter within a security management environment. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Singhal in order to enable the provisioning of better services by content providers. (see Singhal paragraph [0062], lines 1-6)

Regarding Claim 11, Moriconi discloses the method and computer usable medium of claim 10, wherein said resource is affiliated with another resource, and wherein further a policy decision for said other resource is received from said remote source and stored in said local memory. (see Moriconi paragraph [0050], lines 1-5: program, computer usable medium; paragraph [0024], lines 1-9: local client security policy to a client, policy definition within local memory; paragraph [0056], lines 1-12: linked resources, policy for

2nd resource based on 1st resource) Moriconi does not specifically disclose the processing of a policy decision. However, Singhal discloses wherein a policy decision for said other resource. (see Singhal paragraph [0062], lines 7-11: local memory storage of policy decision)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Moriconi as taught by Singhal to enable the usage of a policy decision parameter within a security management environment. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Singhal in order to enable the provisioning of better services by content providers. (see Singhal paragraph [0062], lines 1-6)

Regarding Claim 14, Moriconi discloses the method of claims 10, wherein receiving said notification (see Moriconi paragraph [0082], lines 8-13: distribute (i.e. notification) updated policy information) also comprises an updated version of said policy definition in local memory. (see Moriconi paragraph [0082], lines 1-3: updated version of policy definition; paragraph [0082], lines 7-13: updated version transmitted to clients; paragraph [0068], lines 4-9: evaluate request)

Regarding Claim 16, Moriconi discloses the method of claim 10 further comprising: sending a message to said remote source, said message requesting updates for policy definitions stored in said local memory. (see Moriconi paragraph [0024], lines 1-9: local client security policy transmitted to a client, policy definition within local memory; paragraph [0174], lines 1-5: request to server for policy change information) Moriconi

does not specifically disclose processing security information utilizing a policy decision parameter. However, Singhal discloses wherein policy decisions stored in said memory. (see Singhal paragraph [0062], lines 7-11: local memory storage of policy decision)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Moriconi as taught by Singhal to enable the usage of a policy decision parameter within a security management environment. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Singhal in order to enable the provisioning of better services by content providers. (see Singhal paragraph [0062], lines 1-6)

Regarding Claim 18, Moriconi discloses the method of claim 10 further comprising: receiving from said remote source a condition associated with said policy definition, wherein said condition is enforced locally. (see Moriconi paragraph [0047], lines 15-20: policy definition enforced based on local security policy or locally)

Regarding Claim 19, Moriconi discloses a method, computer-readable medium having computer-readable program code embodied therein for causing a computer system to perform a method of controlling access to resources, said method comprising:

- b) receiving a first request for access to said resource, said first request comprising said requester identifying information; (see Moriconi paragraph [0050], lines 1-5: program, computer usable medium; paragraph [0068], lines 1-3: access request processed, subject or requestor identified)

Moriconi discloses storing a policy definition for a resource in local memory, said policy decision based on a policy definition governing access to said resource and on requester identifying information provided to said source, and evaluating said request using said policy decision in said local memory instead of referring said request to said source for evaluation. (see Moriconi paragraph [0068], lines 4-9: process or evaluate access request; paragraph [0076], lines 16-19; paragraph [0024], lines 1-9: policy definition processed locally or by local security policy, policy definition local client security policy stored within local memory, access policy based on subject or requestor identification) Moriconi does not specifically disclose a policy decision for a resource in local memory, said policy decision received from a source of policy definitions, said policy decision based on a policy definition governing access to said resource.

However, Singhal discloses:

- a) a policy decision for a resource in local memory, said policy decision received from a remote source of policy definitions, said policy decision based on a policy definition governing access to said remote resource; (see Singhal paragraph [0062], lines 7-11: policy decision storage in local memory)
- c) evaluating said first request using said policy decision in said local memory (see Singhal paragraph [0062], lines 7-11: storage policy decision parameter in local memory)

And, Moriconi and Singhal disclose:

- d) receiving a notification from said remote source that said policy decision has been updated; (see Moriconi paragraph [0082], lines 8-13: distribute (i.e. notification) updated policy information)
- e) receiving a second request for access to said first resource; and evaluating said second request based said notification ; (see Moriconi paragraph [0068], lines 4-9: evaluate request)

Moriconi does not specifically disclose the processing of an updated policy decision. However, Singhal discloses wherein said policy decision further comprises said notification comprising an update version of said policy decision, and evaluated based on an updated version of said policy decision in said local memory, (see Singhal paragraph [0062], lines 7-11: local memory storage of policy (rules, decisions))

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Moriconi as taught by Singhal to enable the usage of a policy decision for a resource in local memory, said policy decision received from a source of policy definitions, said policy decision based on a policy definition governing access to said resource. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Singhal in order to enable the provisioning of better services by content providers. (see Singhal paragraph [0062], lines 1-6)

Regarding Claim 20, Moriconi discloses the method and computer usable medium of

Art Unit: 2136

claim 19 wherein said resource is affiliated with another resource, and wherein further a policy decision for said other resource is received from said remote source and stored in said local memory. (see Moriconi paragraph [0050], lines 1-5: program, computer usable medium; paragraph [0024], lines 1-9: local client security policy to a client, policy definition within local memory; paragraph [0056], lines 1-12: linked resources, policy for 2nd resource based on 1st resource) Moriconi does not specifically disclose the processing of a policy decision. However, Singhal discloses wherein a policy decision for said other resource. (see Singhal paragraph [0062], lines 7-11: local memory storage of policy decision)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Moriconi as taught by Singhal to enable the usage of a policy decision parameter within a security management environment. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Singhal in order to enable the provisioning of better services by content providers. (see Singhal paragraph [0062], lines 1-6)

Regarding Claim 22, Moriconi discloses the computer-readable medium of claim 19 wherein said computer-readable program code embodied therein causes said computer system to perform said method further comprising: sending a message to said source, said message requesting updates for policy definitions stored in said memory. (see Moriconi paragraph [0174], lines 1-5: request updates to policy definitions) Moriconi does not specifically disclose processing security information utilizing a policy decision parameter. However, Singhal discloses wherein policy decisions stored in said

Art Unit: 2136

memory. (see Singhal paragraph [0062], lines 7-11: local memory storage of policy decision)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Moriconi as taught by Singhal to enable the usage of a policy decision parameter within a security management environment. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Singhal in order to enable the provisioning of better services by content providers. (see Singhal paragraph [0062], lines 1-6)

6. Claims 8, 17, 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moriconi-Singhal and further in view of Chakraborty et al. (US Patent No. 20040054791).

Regarding Claim 8, Moriconi discloses the method of claim 1 wherein said policy definition is valid is also received from said remote source and stored locally. (see Moriconi paragraph [0081], lines 1-5: policy definition is valid; paragraph [0047], lines 15-20; paragraph [0076], lines 16-19: policy received, received and stored locally) Moriconi not specifically disclose processing security information utilizing a policy decision parameter. However, Singhal discloses wherein said policy decision. (see Singhal paragraph [0062], lines 7-11: local memory storage of policy decision)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Moriconi as taught by Singhal to enable the usage of a policy decision parameter within a security management environment. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated

to employ the teachings of Singhal in order to enable the provisioning of better services by content providers. (see Singhal paragraph [0062], lines 1-6)

Moriconi-Singhal does not specifically disclose an expiration time for policy decision. However, Chakraborty discloses wherein a period of time said policy information is valid. (see Chakraborty paragraph [0016], lines 4-9; paragraph [0019], lines 6-12: security policy information processing; paragraph [0051], lines 2-3; paragraph [0053], lines 5-7: policy information with time based expiration condition or period of time policy information valid)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Moriconi-Singhal as taught by Chakraborty to enable the usage of a period of time policy information is valid. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Chakraborty in order to enable the sharing of the same core policy library across various web servers. (see Chakraborty paragraph [0020], lines 1-6: “*... allows users to configure multiple instances of the same web server with an already installed version of the agent. Instead of reinstalling multiple copies of the shared library or dynamically linked library, the same core policy library is shared across various web servers ...*”)

Regarding Claim 17, Moriconi discloses the method of claim 10 further comprising: receiving information that identifies said policy definition is valid. (see Moriconi paragraph [0081], lines 1-5: determine policy definition valid) Singhal does not

specifically disclose processing security information utilizing a policy decision parameter. However, Singhal discloses wherein said policy decision. (see Singhal paragraph [0062], lines 7-11: local memory storage of policy decision)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Moriconi as taught by Singhal to enable the usage of a policy decision parameter within a security management environment. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Singhal in order to enable the provisioning of better services by content providers. (see Singhal paragraph [0062], lines 1-6)

Moriconi-Singhal does not specifically disclose an expiration time for policy decision. However, Chakraborty discloses wherein a period of time said policy information is valid. (see Chakraborty paragraph [0016], lines 4-9; paragraph [0019], lines 6-12: security policy information processing; paragraph [0051], lines 2-3; paragraph [0053], lines 5-7: policy information, time based expiration condition or period of time policy information is valid)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Moriconi-Singhal as taught by Chakraborty to enable the usage of a period of time policy information is valid. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Chakraborty in order to enable the sharing of the same core policy library across various web servers. (see Chakraborty paragraph [0020], lines 1-6: *“... allows users to configure multiple instances of the same web server with an already installed version of the agent. Instead of reinstalling multiple copies of the shared library or dynamically linked library, the same core policy library is shared across*

various web servers ...")

Regarding Claim 23, Moriconi discloses the computer-usable medium of claim 19 wherein a policy definition is valid, is also received from said remote source, and stored locally. (see Moriconi paragraph [0024], lines 1-6: policy definition, stored locally within local client security policy transmitted to a client) Singhal does not specifically disclose processing security information utilizing a policy decision parameter. However, Singhal discloses wherein said policy decision. (see Singhal paragraph [0062], lines 7-11: local memory or storage of policy decision)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Moriconi as taught by Singhal to enable the usage of a policy decision parameter within a security management environment. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Singhal in order to enable the provisioning of better services by content providers. (see Singhal paragraph [0062], lines 1-6)

Moriconi-Singhal does not specifically disclose an expiration time for policy decision. However, Chakraborty discloses wherein a period of time said policy decision is valid. (see Chakraborty paragraph [0016], lines 4-9; paragraph [0019], lines 6-12: security policy information processing; paragraph [0051], lines 2-3; paragraph [0053], lines 5-7: policy information with time based expiration condition or period of time policy information is valid)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Moriconi-Singhal as taught by Chakraborty to enable the usage of a period of time policy

Art Unit: 2136

information is valid. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ the teachings of Chakraborty in order to enable the sharing of the same core policy library across various web servers. (see Chakraborty paragraph [0020], lines 1-6)

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Carlton V. Johnson whose telephone number is 571-270-1032. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday , 8:00 - 5:00PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nasser Moazzami can be reached on 571-272-4195. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

Art Unit: 2136

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Carlton V. Johnson
Examiner
Art Unit 2136

C.J.

CVJ

September 17, 2007

NASSER MOAZZAMI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

10/11/07